

1 Nicole Lavallee (SBN 165755)  
2 Email: nlavallee@bermantabacco.com  
3 Daniel E. Barenbaum (SBN 209261)  
4 Email: dbarenbaum@bermantabacco.com  
5 Jeffrey Rocha (SBN 304852)  
6 Email: jrocha@bermantabacco.com  
7 **BERMAN TABACCO**  
8 425 California Street, Suite 2300  
9 San Francisco, CA 94104  
10 Telephone: (415) 433-3200  
11 Facsimile: (415) 433-6382

12 Catherine Pratsinakis (Admitted *pro hac vice*)  
13 Email: cpratsinakis@dilworthlaw.com  
14 **DILWORTH PAXSON LLP**  
15 1500 Market Street, Suite 3500E  
16 Philadelphia, PA 19102  
17 Telephone: (215) 575-7013

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Roberto Verthelyi*  
19 *and the Putative Class*

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

ROBERTO VERTHELYI, on behalf ) No. 2:24-cv-05028-MWF-JC  
of himself and all others similarly )  
situated, ) CLASS ACTION  
Plaintiff, )  
v. ) **PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR**  
PennyMac Mortgage Investment Trust ) **JUDICIAL NOTICE IN**  
and PNMAC Capital Management, ) **SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION**  
LLC, ) **TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS**  
Defendants. ) **TO DISMISS**  
Date: November 18, 2024  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Ctrm: 5A  
Judge: Michael W. Fitzgerald

---

[No. 2:24-cv-05028-MWF-JC] PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL  
NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS  
TO DISMISS

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, and in connection  
3 with Plaintiff Roberto Verthelyi's ("Plaintiff") Opposition to Defendants  
4 PennyMac Mortgage Investment Trust's ("the Trust") and PNMAC Capital  
5 Management, LLC's ("PCM") (together, "PennyMac" or "Defendants") Motions to  
6 Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint ("Oppositions") (ECF Nos. 34 & 35).<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff  
7 respectfully requests the Court take judicial notice of the following documents  
8 attached to the Declaration of Catherine Pratsinakis in Support of Plaintiff's  
9 Request for Judicial Notice in Support of Opposition to Defendants' Motions to  
10 Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint ("Pratsinakis Decl."), filed herewith:

11 Ex. 1. Transcript of Congressional Hearing titled, *The End of LIBOR:*  
12 *Transitioning to an Alternative Interest Rate Calculation for*  
13 *Mortgages, Student Loans, Business Borrowing, and Other*  
14 *Financial Products*, before the Subcommittee on Investor  
15 Protection, Entrepreneurship, and Capital Markets of the Committee  
16 on Financial Services, U.S. House of Representatives, 117<sup>th</sup>  
17 Congress, First Session (April 15, 2021);  
18 Ex. 2. Transcript of Congressional Hearing titled, *The LIBOR Transition:*  
19 *Protecting Consumers and Investors*, before the Committee on  
20 Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, 117<sup>th</sup> Congress,  
21 First Session on Examining How the Financial System Can Move  
22 on From the LIBOR System (Nov. 2, 2021);  
23 Ex. 3. Congressional Record (House), *Adjustable Interest Rate (LIBOR)*  
24 *Act of 2021*, 167 Cong. Rec. H7479-01 (Dec. 8, 2021);

25  
26  
27 <sup>1</sup> All capitalized terms not otherwise defined herein have the same meaning as in  
28 Plaintiff's Oppositions.

1                   Ex. 4. Excerpted pages from PennyMac Mortgage Investment Trust’s  
2                   Annual Report on Form 10-K for the fiscal year ended December  
3                   31, 2023 (“2023 Form 10-K”), filed with the U.S. Securities and  
4                   Exchange Commission (“SEC”) on February 22, 2024;  
5                   Ex. 5. Official list of the Trust’s filings from Maryland Department of  
6                   Assessments and Taxation Maryland; and  
7                   Ex. 6. Impac Mortgage Holdings, Inc.’s Articles Supplementary  
8                   Designating the Company’s 9.375% Series B Preferred Stock  
9                   (“Impac Mortgage Holdings, Inc.’s Articles Supplementary”).

10                  For the reasons that follow, the Court should grant Plaintiff’s Request for  
11                  Judicial Notice as the documents in question are public records not reasonably  
12                  subject to dispute under Federal Rule of Evidence 201(b).

13                  For Pratsinakis Decl. Exhibits 1, 2, and 3—legislative history—the Court  
14                  should grant Plaintiff’s request for judicial notice because, as public records, they  
15                  are not subject to reasonable dispute. Additionally, judicial notice of these  
16                  documents is appropriate due to ambiguities raised by Defendants through their  
17                  interpretations of key provisions of the statutes and regulations at issue in this  
18                  action—interpretations at odds with the allegations of Plaintiff’s Complaint and  
19                  those positions asserted in Plaintiff’s Opposition.

20                  For Pratsinakis Decl. Exhibits 4, 5, and 6—two SEC filings (Ex. 4 and Ex. 6)  
21                  and a corporate document officially filed with the State of Maryland (Exs. 5)—  
22                  Defendants concede through their own concurrently-filed request for judicial notice  
23                  that these types of documents are proper subjects for judicial notice, leaving no  
24                  dispute as to the Court’s ability to consider them. *See* Defendants’ Request for  
25                  Judicial Notice in Support of Their Motions to Dismiss Plaintiff’s Complaint  
26                  (“Defendants’ RJN” or “Defs.’ RJN”) (ECF 36). Indeed, the documents are public  
27                  records filed on government websites and are readily available for download.

1 **II. ARGUMENT**

2 A district court may consider matters outside the pleadings when ruling on a  
3 Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss if those matters are properly subject to judicial  
4 notice. *Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.*, 899 F.3d 988, 998-99 (9th Cir. 2018)  
5 (citing *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.*, 551 U.S. 308, 322 (2007)),  
6 *subsequent determination*, 805 F. App'x 525 (9th Cir. 2020). “Judicial notice under  
7 Rule 201 permits a court to notice an adjudicative fact if it is “not subject to  
8 reasonable dispute.” *Id.* at 999 (quoting Fed. R. Evid. 201(b)). “A fact is ‘not subject  
9 to reasonable dispute’ if it is ‘generally known,’ or ‘can be accurately and readily  
10 determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.’” *Id.*

11 **A. The Court May Properly Consider Legislative History**

12 Plaintiff requests that the Court take judicial notice of Pratsinakis Decl.  
13 Exhibits 1, 2, and 3, which are transcripts from Congressional hearings and the  
14 Congressional record leading to the enactment of the Adjustable Interest Rate  
15 (LIBOR) Act, 12 U.S.C. § 5801 *et seq.* (the “LIBOR Act”), and its implementing  
16 regulations, 12 C.F.R. pt. 253 *et seq.* (the “LIBOR Rule”). As this Court has  
17 observed, legislative history is an appropriate source for judicial notice since  
18 “[t]hese documents are not subject to reasonable dispute because as legislative  
19 history they are matters of public record.” *Schroeder v. Envoy Air, Inc.*, No. CV 16-  
20 04911-MWF-KS, 2016 WL 11520388, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2016) (citing  
21 *Anderson v. Holder*, 673 F.3d 1089, 1103 (9th Cir. 2012) (“Legislative history is  
22 properly a subject of judicial notice”)); *Lee v. CarMax Auto Superstores California,*  
23 *LLC*, No. CV137648MWFVBKX, 2015 WL 12662332, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 23,  
24 2015) (same).

25 Here, the parties dispute the meaning and interpretation of key provisions of  
26 the LIBOR Act and Rule (both expressly and implicitly), as well as how they should  
27 be interpreted. This dispute forms the very basis of Plaintiff’s claims.

1       While both parties maintain that the law clearly and by its express terms  
2 supports their respective positions, the parties' differing interpretations reveal  
3 arguable ambiguities that warrant closer examination of legislative history. In such  
4 cases, “[g]iven the absence of caselaw and the question about the scope of [a  
5 statute's] reach,” judicial notice of legislative history is appropriate. *Johnson v.*  
6 *Serenity Transp., Inc.*, No. 15-CV-02004-JSC, 2016 WL 270952, at \*7 n.6 (N.D.  
7 Cal. Jan. 22, 2016); *see also Garcia v. Pacificare of Cal. Inc.*, No. SACV-12-02022-  
8 JVS-RNBx, 2013 WL 12114019, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2013) (granting judicial  
9 notice of legislative history and noting that, while courts generally follow the plain  
10 meaning of a statute, they may look beyond the literal meaning to ensure it aligns  
11 with the statute's purpose, as “intent prevails over the letter, and the letter will, if  
12 possible, be so read as to conform to the spirit of the act”; if ambiguous, courts must  
13 consult legislative history for further guidance) (citation omitted), *aff'd*, 750 F.3d  
14 1113 (9th Cir. 2014); *Pyara v. Sysco Corp.*, No. 2:15-CV-01208-JAM-KJN,  
15 2016 WL 3916339, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. July 20, 2016) (“Moreover, if the legislature's  
16 intent is not clear from its language, a court may take judicial notice of legislative  
17 history . . . .”); *Frieri v. Sysco Corp.*, No. 16-CV-1432 JLS (NLS), 2016 WL  
18 7188282, at \*2 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2016) (same).

19       Accordingly, the Court should consider Pratsinakis Decl. Exhibits 1, 2, and 3.

20       **B. The Court May Properly Consider the Trust's 2023 Form 10-K**

21       Plaintiff requests that the Court take judicial notice of Pratsinakis Decl.  
22 Exhibit 4, excerpted pages from the Trust's 2023 Form 10-K. Defendants agree that  
23 “[c]ourts may take judicial notice of public records and government documents  
24 available from reliable sources on the Internet such as websites run by governmental  
25 agencies.” Defs.' RJN at 1 (citing *Maxon v. Fuller Theological Seminary*, 549 F.  
26 Supp. 3d 1116, 1122 (C.D. Cal. 2020)).

1 Pratsinakis Decl. Exhibit 4, the Trust’s 2023 Form 10-K, is a public record  
2 filed with the SEC and is readily available for download on its official website.  
3 Plaintiff requests judicial notice of Pratsinakis Decl. Exhibit 3 to demonstrate how  
4 Defendants describe their relationship in publicly-filed disclosures with the SEC.  
5 Courts in this Circuit, including this Court, routinely hold that SEC filings are  
6 appropriate for judicial notice. *See Samantha B. v. Am. Int’l Grp., Inc.*, No. CV-20-  
7 8895-MWF-JPRx, 2020 WL 6700174, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2020) (judicially  
8 noticing Annual Report on Form 10-K because it was “not subject to reasonable  
9 dispute”); *In re Ethereummax Inv.*, No. CV-22-00163-MWF-SKx, 2023 WL  
10 6787827, at \*39 (C.D. Cal. June 6, 2023) (“Information on government agency  
11 websites has often been treated as properly subject to judicial notice.”); *In re  
12 Twitter, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 506 F. Supp. 3d 867, at 875 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2020)  
13 (citing authorities for proposition that SEC filings are appropriately noticed by the  
14 Court on a motion to dismiss), *aff’d*, 29 F.4th (9th Cir. 2022); *Metzler Inv. GMBH  
15 v. Corinthian Colls., Inc.*, 540 F.3d 1049, 1064 n.7 (9th Cir. 2008) (SEC filings  
16 subject to judicial notice); *Dreiling v. Am. Express Co.*, 458 F.3d 942, 946 n.2 (9th  
17 Cir. 2006) (same).

18 Accordingly, the Court should grant Plaintiff’s request for judicial notice of  
19 Pratsinakis Decl. Exhibit 4.

20 **C. The Court May Properly Consider the Trust’s and Impac  
21 Mortgage Holdings, Inc.’s Officially Filed Corporate Documents**

22 Plaintiff requests that the Court take judicial notice of Pratsinakis Decl.  
23 Exhibits 5 and 6—an official list of the Trust’s filings from Maryland Department  
24 of Assessments and Taxation (Ex. 5) and a copy of Impac Mortgage Holdings,  
25 Inc.’s Articles Supplementary filed with the SEC (Ex. 6)—to demonstrate that the  
26  
27

1 Trust did not incorporate the Articles at issue into its Declaration of Trust.<sup>2</sup> These  
2 documents are similar in nature to the corporate documents submitted by  
3 Defendants in their Request for Judicial Notice and are responsive to Defendants'  
4 claim that the Declaration of Trust was incorporated by reference into the Articles  
5 Supplementary. *See* Exhibits A-C to the Declaration of Matthew Donald Umhofer  
6 in Support of Defendants' Request for Judicial Notice (ECF 36-2, 36-3, 36-4). As  
7 Defendants acknowledge, “[c]ourts addressing motions to dismiss routinely notice  
8 organizational governance documents from a state’s website.” Defs.’ RJN at 1  
9 (citing *Risto v. Screen Actors Guild - Am. Fed’n of Television & Radio Artists*, No.  
10 2:18-cv-07241-CAS-PLA, 2018 WL 7016345, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2018) and  
11 *Verduzco v. St. Mary’s High Sch.*, No. 2:23-cv-02269-KJM-CSK, 2024 WL  
12 3088467, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. June 21, 2024)). Additionally, for the same reasons set  
13 forth above with regard to Exhibit 4, the Trust’s 2023 Form 10-K, Exhibit 6 is  
14 judicially noticeable as a public record filed with the SEC and readily available for  
15 download on its official website.

16 Accordingly, the Court should take judicial notice of Pratsinakis Decl.  
17 Exhibits 5 and 6, which are not subject to reasonable dispute.

18 **III. CONCLUSION**

19 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court take  
20 judicial notice of Exhibits 1 through 4 for the purposes discussed herein.

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24

25

26

27 <sup>2</sup> See Trust’s Mem. at 8 n. 6.

1 Dated: October 11, 2024

**BERMAN TABACCO**

2  
3 By: /s/ Daniel E. Barenbaum  
4 Daniel E. Barenbaum

5 Nicole Lavallee  
6 Jeffrey Rocha  
7 425 California Street, Suite 2300  
8 San Francisco, CA 94104  
9 Telephone: (415) 433-3200  
10 Facsimile: (415) 433-6382  
11 Email: nlavallee@bermantabacco.com  
12 dbarenbaum@bermantabacco.com  
13 jrocha@bermantabacco.com

14 Catherine Pratsinakis (*pro hac vice*)  
15 **DILWORTH PAXSON LLP**  
16 1500 Market Street, Suite 3500E  
17 Philadelphia, PA 19102  
18 Telephone: (215) 575-7013  
19 Email: cpratsinakis@dilworthlaw.com

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Roberto Verthelyi*  
[No. 2:24-cv-05028-MWF-JC] PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL  
NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS  
TO DISMISS